

# SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

21st Year of Publication  
The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXI, No. 4

P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015

©March 1, 1991

## ***Stanford's Padded Bills Bring Congressional Inquiry***

Caught redhanded padding indirect costs on federal research grants, Stanford University has responded with mock indignation, nickel-and-dime repentance, and the hiring of a squad of influential figures to wage its fight against mounting trouble in Washington. Stanford needs them.

Stanford initially responded to the charges by claiming last October that it had not overbilled the government. Rather, it contended, it had actually underbilled by \$13 million in indirect costs over a 10-year period.

As the case unfolded, however, Stanford acknowledged that it had billed the federal government for indirect costs that it had attributed to a \$17,500 wedding reception that the university trustees held for Stanford President Donald Kennedy and his wife in 1987.

It's estimated that Washington toasted the bride and groom with about \$4000 of the reception costs. The University also admitted taking indirect costs on a jacuzzi-equipped 72-foot sailboat that it received as a gift in 1987. In contrition for that, it agreed to repay \$184,286 to the federal government.

Stanford also announced that "\$500,000 of general administration costs" for the presidential residence and two other residences "will be withdrawn permanently." In reference to this move, a Stanford press release, dated February 14, stated that "serious questions" have been raised about the residential costs. Not noted was that the housing costs charged to the government included installation of a cedar closet and refurbishing of a piano in the Kennedy residence.

On March 15, the case will be the subject of a hearing chaired by Rep. John Dingell (D-Mich.), the sulfurous Chairman of both the Energy and Commerce Committee and its Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, host of the hearing. Dingell, backed by what is generally regarded as the most capable and aggressive investigative staff on Capitol Hill, has repeatedly hit paydirt in defense-contracting and Wall Street scandals. He feels that he's got another promising area in indirect costs, often murky defined but now accounting for some 30 percent of federal funds appro-

*(Continued on Page 2)*

## **Policy Clashes and Plaudits For Bromley at House Hearing**

D. Allan Bromley, the President's Science Adviser, went before the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee (SS&T) February 20 for its eighth annual "R&D Posture Hearing," and got punched around a bit more than is customary for these proceedings. He was challenged and sometimes unresponsive on the new budget's omission of funds for university research facilities and on the rising costs and flaky price estimates for the Superconducting Supercollider (SSC). He was also grilled on the ideological collision between the White House's support for nuclear power and its stated abhorrence of "industrial policy."

Nonetheless, Bromley, more professorial than political, retains high standing on Capitol Hill, where he is candid in manner if not always in substance. Good things in funding and policy tend to be credited to his account, while the failings are attributed to dark political powers beyond his control.

With the Science Adviser as the only witness, the Posture Hearing is intended as a prelude to the SS&T Committee's year-long legislative deliberations, which cover most federally supported science and technology outside of health and defense. In the Congressional committee structure, SS&T, as

*(Continued on Page 3)*

## **In Brief**

Approved last year by Congress, with little public notice, and now being set up: the National Foundation for Biomedical Research, a non-profit corporation to raise money for financing super-salaried research posts at NIH. The legislation says the positions may be filled by federal and non-federal researchers. The Institute of Medicine has been assigned to recommend candidates for Board membership. Senator Kennedy, a prime mover of the legislation, is an ex-officio Board member. The establishing act specifies that the Foundation is not an agency of the government.

*Next year's 16 percent budget boost proposed for NSF by the White House was intended to make up for previous shortfalls on the planned schedule of a five-year doubling of the Foundation's budget. But trouble looms from the Gulf. In the Congressional appropriations process, funds for NSF come from the same fixed sum that finances the Department of Veterans Affairs. As the troops come home, few legislators will say no to the DVA's budget hopes.*

While discussing austerity measures at a meeting last month of the Columbia University faculty senate, President Michael Sovern was challenged by a faculty member who asserted that his \$297,000 salary is excessive in these hard times. Sovern replied: "For \$20,000 less, you can get John Silber"—the Boston University President, renowned for acrimonious relations with his faculty.

## ... Dingell Committee Also Looking at Other Schools

(Continued from Page 1)

priated for academic research.

Stanford is first on the Dingell griddle, but the Subcommittee is also looking at other major research institutions. Harvard Medical School is on the list, Subcommittee sources tell SGR. Among likely other candidates are MIT, the University of Pennsylvania, Columbia, and Johns Hopkin—all so-called top-dollar institutions in federal research funds and overhead rates.

While Stanford has so far admitted only to what it contends are minor and unwitting infractions, the essence of these confessed sins and the evolution of Stanford's responses have stimulated the Dingell operation to the expectation of a great deal more to come out.

The Stanford case arose last year when a Navy auditor, Paul Biddle, said that the university was reaping excessive indirect-cost payments because of lax supervision and cozy relations with its federal benefactors. Stanford, with some \$250 million, ranks second among the nation's universities in receipt of federal grants and contracts. Its indirect-cost rate, 74 percent (recently trimmed to 72 percent), is close to the top, and is said to be second only to tuition as a source of income for the university.

Biddle's allegations of \$200 million or more in unjustified indirect-cost payments over a decade have been dismissed as excessive by the Office of Navy Research Inspector General, one of several government agencies looking into Stanford's financial relations with federal agencies. But the Inspector General said that "there appears to be some validity" to Biddle's allegations, according to the *Los Angeles Times*.

The Defense Contract Audit Agency subsequently recommended termination of an estimated 100 or more "memorandums of understanding" (MOUs) between Stanford and federal research agencies—a conspicuous number, given that the next highest collection is a mere eight, at MIT, Subcommittee sources say. The MOUs, usually providing for exceptions to standing rules on government grants and contracts, were deemed "substantially noncompliant" with federal regulations and "not considered to be in the government's interest," according to the *Stanford Daily*.

That Stanford considers itself in something more serious than a bookkeeping spat may be inferred from the caliber of the troops it has hired to fight its case. Last summer, Kennedy was seen around Washington recruiting legal and public-relations counsel. Among those he eventually signed up was Thomas Ryan, of the law firm Wunder, Ryan, Cannon & Thelan. Ryan formerly served as Chief Counsel on Dingell's full Committee. Also retained was James Fitzpatrick, a partner in Arnold & Porter, a preeminent political law firm in the capital.

For the public-relations front, always important in dealing with Dingell, Kennedy hired Frank Mankiewicz, Vice President of Hill & Knowlton, the country's biggest PR firm.

Mankiewicz's political combat experience dates back to service as Bobby Kennedy's press secretary, and is reported to have been utilized in prepping Kennedy for a 20/20 TV report on the Stanford case.

In announcing the withdrawal of \$500,000 in housing charges, the university also revealed the creation of "Stanford's Special Advisory Panel on Standards of Accountability for Federal Research Costs." Members are:

Joseph E. Connon, Chairman, Price Waterhouse World Firm; Timothy S. Healy, former President of Georgetown University, now President of the New York Public Library; Bobby Inman, retired Admiral and former Director of the National Security Agency; Paul H. O'Neill, Chairman and CEO, Alcoa, and Maxine Singer, President, Carnegie Institution of Washington. All are connected to important power centers in Washington.

The Stanford defense is in the classic Watergate style of diverting attention from wrongdoing by assailing the press for revelations of wrongdoing. The act is followed by an ascent to the high road of public service. In a statement issued in December, for example, Kennedy complained that "The present pattern of highly selective disclosure is not only unfair and damaging to Stanford: it presents a greater risk as well. The research universities of this country have made a magnificent contribution to our national welfare through new technology and new knowledge. That capacity has been nourished by a set of enlightened federal policies concerning the funding of University research. It would be a tragic outcome if those policies were threatened by incomplete and often inaccurate reports of the kind we have seen."

He didn't cite a reference for federal support of wedding receptions.

But don't doubt the effectiveness of the Stanford dodge. In covering the Stanford affair, *Science*, the weekly journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, is serving, as usual, as the compliant puppet for establishment ventriloquism. A news article in the February 15 issue refers to the March 15 Dingell hearing and states: "As

(Continued on Page 3)

© 1991, Science & Government Report, Inc.

Editor and Publisher  
**Daniel S. Greenberg**

European Correspondent  
**Francois Seguer (Paris)**

Associate Publisher  
**Wanda J. Reif**

Circulation Manager  
**Glen D. Grant**

Independently published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, \$325.00 (two years, \$555.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

## ... Bromley Says Funds Needed for New Labs, But—

(Continued from Page 1)

an authorizing committee, is secondary to the money-voting Appropriations Committee, which frequently ignore authorizations or go ahead without them. Traditionally, the Committee has been more of a forum for talk than a power center, and among choices for committee assignments, it has ranked middling to low. But high ambitions for the Committee have been stated by SS&T's new Chairman, George Brown (D-Calif.), no doubt contributing to the big crowd that turned out for Bromley's appearance.

After the customary expressions of affection, respect, and admiration were exchanged by the witness and Committee members, serious questioning began—interspersed with expectable inanities from several Members. But most of the questions were well-targeted, though follow-up was difficult under a rule that held questioning to rounds of five minutes per member.

Noting the proposed elimination of NSF's \$20 million fund for research facilities, Chairman Brown expressed doubt that the needed funds could be derived from depreciation charges included in indirect-cost payments, as suggested in the new budget. "Now, that doesn't do justice to those universities that don't have huge volumes of grants," Brown said.

Bromley fell in step with the Chairman, stating that "I do not believe that the cash flow from use charges and amortization charges and so on can, starting from where we are now, do the job. I believe that we have quite a defined catch-up problem to get the [research] infrastructure back to a level that we would consider acceptable..." After that's accomplished, Bromley continued, "we must work out a gentlemen's agreement" to assure that depreciation funds are not mixed into general accounts. Bromley didn't say whether money for buildings would be forthcoming, and he wasn't pressed on the point.

He next had to contend with the legislative nemesis of the

### Stanford (Continued from Page 2)

those hearings approach, leaks from investigators have created a steady stream of scandalous newspaper fare: football bashes for the faculty and a university trustees' reception following the wedding of university president Donald Kennedy were charged in part to research, along with a \$1.2 million yacht and expensive flower arrangements for the president's house. The bad press was enough to induce Stanford to return \$500,000 of charges for the president's house and related expenses to the government, even though it stands by its original judgment that the charges for all but the yacht were illegal. But that gesture isn't going to shelter Stanford—or any of the other major US research universities—from the storm ahead."

There is, of course, no doubt that research universities could make good use of additional federal funds. Chiseling the government, however, is not acceptable.—DSG

Texas-bound SSC, Rep. Sherwood L. Boehlert, an upstate New York Republican who took seriously the claim that the SSC would be an "international" facility, and unsuccessfully supported a site spanning the US-Canadian border. Since then, Boehlert has specialized in embarrassing questions about the project, which isn't too difficult, given the numerous evasions and misrepresentations that have assisted the SSC through Congress.

Noting that despite a generally tight budget situation, a 120 percent increase has been proposed for the SSC next year, Boehlert inquired about the "the prior pledge that the SSC would not be built at the expense of other research programs."

Acknowledging "a very difficult question," Bromley commenced a long-winded reply that noted the pledge referred to by Boehlert and a second proviso, that "one-third of the cost be borne by non-federal sources." Foreign governments, Bromley said, "are not going to make any commitments until such time as they see actual construction. That is not surprising. We would not do it either."

But the proviso for no impact on other research "poses some very major difficulties," Bromley said, noting \$8.2 billion as the latest cost estimate. The cost problems, Bromley conceded, are so difficult that Secretary of Energy James D. Watkins "felt that he was unable to address" them in Congressional testimony two days earlier.

Boehlert responded, "If I may interrupt here. Admiral Watkins, isn't he the Cabinet officer that said we wouldn't go forward if it cost one penny more than \$5.9 billion?"

Bromley remained silent, and Boehlert said, "Well, all right. I just wanted to add that in for the record." Bromley replied, "I'm afraid I was not present when that statement was made." Pointing out that the SSC might be affected by budget caps on domestic spending, Bromley suggested a miraculous solution:

"Now, there is always the possibility," he said, "that instead of being constructed at the expense of other parts of the science and technology budget, that the proponents of SSC may be able to convince you and your colleagues that in fact some other area of discretionary domestic spending might in fact be more vulnerable."

Letting that go by without comment, Boehlert noted that the official SSC estimate "is up over \$8 billion, and there is an in-house cost estimate that is over \$11 billion. And where do we stop? I mean, where do we finally make a decision that this is too much?" the Congressman asked.

"That's a decision, sir, that will necessarily be made by you and your colleagues," Bromley replied, adding that "I can't tell you what the actual cost will be. I don't think anyone can."

Rep. Dana Rohrabacher, a California Republican, asked Bromley whether he was concerned about sales of American technology to Japan.

(Continued on Page 4)

## ... Nuclear Industry Requires Special Assistance

(Continued from Page 3)

Bromley replied: "I am concerned, sir. I think it is very important for us to keep in mind that there are, in fact, only three industrial sectors in our country that have managed to maintain sound, solid, positive balance-of-payment records"—pharmaceuticals, chemicals, and aerospace. The first two, he said, "have achieved that result because they have been very effective in achieving protection of their intellectual property." Aerospace, he continued, has benefited "from a synergism between our military needs and civilian developments . . ."

Asked whether foreign weapons sales should be confined to finished products, rather than include basic technology, Bromley expressed doubt "that we can prevent other countries from getting [the technologies] either above the table or under the table." He added that "my approach to this is to try to ensure that in the process [of high-tech sales negotiations], we get something of equal value for the US. And I think that we have to be much more aggressive in our negotiations than we have been in the past." Bromley noted, however, that "on a few select technologies that are critical to our activities, I would be much more protective even than we are now."

The questioning was next taken up by Rep. Howard Wolpe, a Michigan Democrat. Wolpe has evoked some notice for himself and the SS&T Committee by giving up the Chairmanship of the Foreign Affairs Africa Subcommittee to become Chairman of the SS&T Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations. Because the intertwined matters of public attention and legislative glory usually govern committee choices, Wolpe's move from the high-prestige Foreign Affairs to a chairmanship on Rep. George Brown's SS&T is taken to indicate that Wolpe is banking on a brighter future for the SS&T Committee.

Noting that Bromley had said earlier that federal support for industrial research should be confined to pre-competitive, generic technologies, Wolpe asked, "how do you see that squaring with the Administration's efforts to revive the commercial nuclear-power industry specifically?" Wolpe added, "I find it rather remarkable that the Administration, proclaiming free-market principles, would support millions of dollars in federal subsidies to help individual corporations bring specific technologies into the marketplace. That sounds a lot like industrial policy to me or picking winners and losers," the Congressman said, applying a dash of irony to the Administration's own terminology.

Bromley replied that nuclear power is "the only technological alternative" that can provide energy without producing greenhouse gases. Government assistance was needed, he said, because the US "did very badly in our introduction of nuclear energy into our economy and we have to essentially start over."

Wolpe: Do you think nuclear power would be commercially viable without federal subsidization?

Bromley: Nuclear power, starting from where we are now, would not be viable without some federal input. . . .

Wolpe: Why would one inherently be more supportive of providing subsidies to nuclear power than subsidization, for example, for efficiency, energy efficiency initiatives? As you know . . . several energy-efficiency initiatives, such as weatherization funding and the like, have also been deleted from the National Energy Strategy. Is there not an inconsistency? . . .

Bromley: I would not wish to claim that the National Energy Strategy or any of our policies are 100-plus percent internally consistent. But I do believe that the only alternative we have at the moment for large blocks of electrical energy is the nuclear one . . .

After Bromley had spent two-and-a-half hours in the witness chair, Chairman Brown praised his performance, expressed confidence that the Committee and the President's Science Adviser would get on well, and called an end to the proceedings. Bromley looked a touch weary as he hurried off with his accompanying staff members to a waiting car.

The hearing is an outline of Congressional concerns about science and technology—again, with the exclusion of health and defense, which are legislatively located elsewhere. All the issues raised at the hearing, plus others, will be dissected in fine detail in coming months at SS&T subcommittee hearings. But the essential fact is that the Committee has relatively little power. For example, the SSC project, budgeted for \$534 million next year, has been moving ahead without a Congressional authorization. The House passed one last year, but the Senate has chosen to ignore the matter, while both houses have been appropriating money for the SSC.

Chairman Brown has declared a goal of legislative power and importance for his Committee, saying he will achieve it with horsetrading, dilatory tactics, and whatever other methods are required. There is hustle and bustle on the Committee—new members and staff and a new subcommittee structure. But the route to power and influence remains difficult.—DSG

### Massey Confirmed, Healy Nominated

Walter Massey, Vice President for Research at the University of Chicago, was confirmed by the Senate on February 21 to be Director of the National Science Foundation and is scheduled to be sworn in and start work there on March 4.

Meanwhile, there's progress toward filling that other long-vacant top job in the federal science establishment, the Directorship of the National Institutes of Health. The long-reported selection of Bernadine Healy, of the Cleveland Clinic, was officially confirmed February 19 when the White House sent her nomination to the Senate. A hearing date has not been set.



## A Political-Science Lecture by Chairman Brown

*The following is from an address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science by Chairman George Brown (D-Calif.), House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, February 15, in Washington.*

How will we spend this \$1.45 trillion [proposed in the President's budget for fiscal 1992]? Believe it or not, there is very little flexibility. Fourteen percent will go to paying the interest on the \$3 trillion national debt. Fifty-one percent will go to entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare. Twenty percent will go to defense. If you've been adding these numbers in your head, you'll see that we've got about 15 percent left—about \$212 billion.

This has to cover all the discretionary programs, ranging from salaries for our judges, to Head Start classes for our poor kids, to highway and bridge repairs, to scientific research. It represents an increase over 1991 spending, but the increase is more or less equal to inflation. In other words, there will be no real growth in discretionary spending. Almost all of these budget decisions were made last fall, and incorporated into a "summit" agreement which most members of Congress will not want to revisit.

The good news is this: Within the budget for discretionary programs, which is a pie of fixed size, many of the agencies which fund scientific research have been singled out by the President for particularly large budget increases. The National Science Foundation, for example, is slated to receive a 16 percent funding increase for research programs. . . .

Now, here's the bad news: Budget cuts totaling about \$10 billion for community development block grants, the National Park Service, energy conservation grants, crop insurance, senior citizens programs, low-income energy assistance, Medicare, family support programs, and veterans benefits. As the Congressional debate over the budget gets under way, the advocates of each of these programs will be scanning the budget for additional funding sources, for areas that seem to be getting more than their fair share. And who do you think they're going to set their hungry eyes on? . . .

I am in fundamental agreement with the major conclusions of the Lederman report [*Science: The End of the Frontier?*, SGR, January 15: "AAAS Head Toots Tin Trumpet for Science Funding"], which are that scientific research in this nation is inadequately funded. . . . These conclusions were derived from a survey of 250 university physicists, biologists, and chemists, who reflected on the state of funding for science with great pain and discouragement.

What worries me about this approach is not its validity, but its lack of uniqueness. One could easily

document a similar level of despair among 250 Medicare recipients, 250 disabled veterans, 250 soldiers in Saudi Arabia, or even among 250 Members of Congress. If we are going to justify the privileged treatment of research and development by the federal government—and we will have to justify it, if we hope to sustain it—then we must present a case that is based not on frustration and discomfort of individual . . . scientists. Rather, we must present a case rooted in the welfare of our nation. . . .

Most of us would instinctively support the assertion that scientific progress is a fundamental cornerstone of our national well-being. But the fact is, one can easily demonstrate that strong federal support for basic scientific research is neither a sufficient, nor a necessary, condition for vigorous economic growth and societal vitality. This is clearly demonstrated in the case of Japan and Germany, whose phenomenal economic growth occurred in the absence of significant government or private funding for basic research. . . .

Undoubtedly, support for basic research is critical for replenishing and expanding the intellectual capital of our scientific and technological society. But federal support for science alone will not ensure that our nation will remain competitive in the high-technology industries of the future. . . .

The linear model of research and development was accepted by policy makers for the first 30 years following World War II in large part because there was no need—in fact there was no way—to test it. The United States didn't have an economic competitiveness problem because there was no competition. . . . The simple science policies of the postwar years are now philosophically and politically insupportable. As scientists, you must view your own efforts as part of a complex system, and you must justify the need for federal support in the context of a broader vision.

I know that most of you are scientists because you love science, and not because you are crusaders for technological advance or economic growth. That is exactly as it should be.

But as a politician, I must tell you that unlimited federal funding for basic research is no longer viewed by the US Congress as a birthright of the scientific community, and I must warn you that the generous support you enjoy today was part of the fallout of the creation of nuclear weapons, not because of the great contributions of science to a more humane society. . . .

The federal budget crisis means, among other things, that there will not be huge increases for the funding of basic research over the next three to five years.

In fact, it will be very difficult to preserve even those funding levels requested by the President, for reasons I alluded to earlier.

## Money Squabbling on the Rise in Ranks of Science

Grumbles about fair shares and priorities are growing in science as tolerance sinks under a sense of privation.

In January, the Council of the American Physical Society—no gang of street fighters—fired rhetorical pot shots at the Space Station and the Super Conducting Supercollider, expressing concerns about their effects on the ranks of “little science” (SGR, February 1). In November, the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, lobbyist for bench scientists, frenetically opposed a modest plan to favor training and facilities in the allocation of government biomedical research funds (SGR, December 1). Among the disciplines, it seems, only the mathematicians politely ask for more without making invidious assertions about the undeserved good fortune of some neighbor.

Now comes another dissent on where research money should go, this one from Maxine Singer, President of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, which runs basic research laboratories in the life sciences, geophysics, and astronomy. Cushioned by a \$224-million endowment, plus federal and private grants, Carnegie is a rarity on the American scientific landscape—freestanding, elite, and affluent. Singer, one of the few women in the National Academy of Sciences, made her professional mark as a researcher at the National Cancer Institute, and holds senior rank in the science-policy establishment.

### *Critical of Foundations*

“While I can speak with pride of the Carnegie Institution’s research,” she wrote in her organization’s latest annual report, “I have some misgivings about some major US foundations. With every good intention, they are turning their resources to the profound problems that plague our country and planet by focusing on the here and now. But in so doing, investing less and less in fundamental research, they are forgetting the importance of banking for the future.”

Singer did not identify these philanthropic myopics, but a prudent guess would include the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations and the Carnegie Corporation of New York (operationally unrelated to the Carnegie Institution of Washington). Formerly prominent in support of basic academic science, they have either dropped out of or reduced their research support in favor of addressing urgent social problems.

Singer said that “many foundations support programs aimed at studying and ameliorating environmental problems. But every study or action program recognizes that its potential impact is lessened by lack of fundamental knowledge about the planet and its ecology. The best that can be done is to recycle an inadequate knowledge base. . . . In the past, in the face of inadequate funding for innovative and risky fundamental research,” she added, “the private founda-

tions, with their capacity for quick response and visionary leadership, would have tended the seed corn.”

Singer also criticized the trend to bigness in scientific research, asserting that “Big national projects, not in themselves uninteresting or unimportant, siphon young scientists to work on ideas other than their own. Very large research groups exist in our universities, led by professors with outstanding achievement records. These scientists can command on the order of half a million dollars or more a year in grant money, and may preside over dozens of graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, technicians, secretaries, and editorial assistants. Often, magnificent science is accomplished,” she acknowledged.

“But what, after all, is the difference between this and the old European style where a single senior professor governed the direction of research? In time, some of these American labs, too, will stagnate. The aging young people in them will have expended their best years in pursuit of someone else’s ideas, interests, and glory.”

Singer went on to deplore “top-down” research, stating that it “engenders the formation of large bureaucracies. These siphon money from research,” she said, “although their cost-effectiveness is questionable. Even more counter-productive is the tendency of bureaucracies to remove major decision-making from scholars who truly understand the scientific and technical issues.”

The divisions in science are at various stages of development. “Big” vs. “small” is a familiar, if misleading, formulation; discipline vs. discipline is a relatively new and still under-developed form of combat. But since many of sciences’ grievances are expressed in Congressional hearing rooms, the slide toward contention is recognized on Capitol Hill.

Addressing the spread of strife, Rep. George Brown, Chairman of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, urged decorum and restraint on his scientific friends in his recent address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science (see P. 5).

Noting that funds are tight, Brown observed that “fiscal constraints can lead to divisiveness, and encourage the proliferation of lobbying efforts focused on individual science projects or disciplines. To some extent,” he cautioned, “this is already occurring, and in the eyes of many members of Congress, it relegates scientists to the level of every other special interest group.”

Brown’s proposed remedy suggests far-fetched faith and hope in the wisdom and restraint of science. As an alternative to interdisciplinary strife, he said, science should “adopt a systemic view, a perspective that encompasses research and development as a whole, and seeks to explicitly identify the connections between the nature of our R&D effort and our economic vitality and quality of life . . .”

Fat chance.—DSG

## More in Print: Journal Ethics, Manpower, Greenhouse

(Continued from Page 8)

tions and consumer susceptibility to panic. In any case, GAO examined pesticides-monitoring systems in Taiwan, South Korea, Japan, Thailand, and Australia. Conclusion: Their lab facilities and techniques are generally good, but food-safety authorities in the five countries "had little information on the pesticides and other chemicals actually used on specific US exported fruits and vegetables."

To prevent similar disruptions, GAO recommends closer ties between US and foreign food-monitoring organizations and routine provision of information on US pesticide practices.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Galthersburg, Md. 20877; tel. 202/275-6241.

**Ethics and Policy in Scientific Publication** (290 pp., \$24.95, prepaid orders only), another round on how science should confront misconduct and other shortfalls in purity. This one is from the Editorial Policy Committee of the Council of Biology Editors, which includes most of the mainstream journals in the life sciences. A major section presents editors' responses to a survey on how they would navigate through various editorial minefields, such as "redundant publication," "disputes over authorship," "possibly unethical research," and "allegations of falsification of data."

The responses are quoted anonymously, reflecting the fallacy that secrecy promotes candor, rather than the reality that it can also mask evasion and misrepresentation. Included are the proceedings of a conference on editorial policies that the Committee held in Washington in October 1988.

Order from: Council of Biology Editors, Inc., 230 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 1200, Chicago, Ill. 60601; tel. 312/372-9800.

**Manpower Problems: Challenging American Leadership in Biomedical Science & Technology** (19 pp.) and **Manpower and Money: Problems of the American Biomedical Research Community—An Opinion Study Among Research Professionals** (6 pp.) in the doomsday fashion that's now the rage among the scientific disciplines, companion documents, both free, warning that serious troubles lie ahead for the biosciences if Washington doesn't promptly dish up a lot more money.

The opinion survey in the latter title, by the Gallup Organization, is a shoddy piece of advocacy shlock decked out as an objective inquiry. The survey population numbered all of 202 "deans and chairpersons," 104 NIH grant holders, and 107 researchers in industry. Eighty-four percent of the academics selected "shortage of research money or funding" as the "single most important problem facing American biomedical research community."

Eighty-seven percent of the NIH grantees responded with "yes" to the question "Should other areas be cut back

to accommodate needs of biomedical research leadership?" These pitches are no credit to science, but they are typical of a genre that is rapidly spreading as scientists seek more government money. The sad fact is that political Washington regards these exercises with suspicion and disdain.

Order from: Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association Foundation, 1100 15th St. NW, Washington, DC 20005; tel. 202/835-3470.

**Ground-Level Views of Global Problems: International Environmental Reporting** (62 pp., no charge), proceedings of a workshop on environmental news reporting in various countries. Included is a worldwide survey of reporting and papers by journalists from Bangladesh, Brazil, and Thailand. The workshop was sponsored by the International Science Writers Association (ISWA) at the 1990 annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. James Cornell, President of ISWA, edited the proceedings.

Order from: James Cornell, President, ISWA, c/o Smithsonian Institution Astrophysical Observatory, 60 Garden St., Cambridge, Mass. 02138; tel. 617/495-7461.

### Correction on a Title

The last issue of SGR gave the wrong title for the interagency budget plan for global-change research prepared under the auspices of the Federal Coordinating Council for Science, Engineering, and Technology, part of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The correct title is: **Our Changing Planet: The FY 1992 US Global Change Research Program** (90 pp., no charge).

Copies are available from: Committee on Earth and Environmental Sciences, c/o US Geological Survey, 104 National Center, Reston, Va. 22092; tel. 703/648-4450.

### To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report  
Northwest Station, Box 6226A  
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed

☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please Bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, \$325.00 ☐  
two years, \$555.00 ☐

(Foreign airmail, \$35.00 per year; foreign surface \$15.00 per year additional.)

Name

Address

Zip

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970;  
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054

## In Print: Basic Energy Research, Biotech Policy, Etc.

*The publications listed are obtainable as indicated—from SGR.*

**Basic Research for Environmental Restoration** (DOE/ER-0482T; 156 pp., no charge), from the Department of Energy, an inventory of basic research that DOE believes will be important for carrying out its herculean task of cleaning up 40 years of spills and dumping at nuclear plants around the country. With estimates in excess of \$100 billion, the cleanup is the nuclear version of the S&L crisis—financially open-ended until done, and therefore a promising new line of support for academic science. The slice for basic research is not stated or even suggested, but it is likely to be substantial. Listed as major topics: Environmental transport and transformations; advanced sampling, characterization, and monitoring methods; new remediation technologies; performance assessment; health and environmental effects.

Order from: Department of Energy, Ecological Research Division, ER-75, Washington, DC 20545; tel. 301/353-4208.

**Report on National Biotechnology Policy** (26 pp., no charge), by the President's Council on Competitiveness (Chairman, Vice President Dan Quayle), a strong appeal to reduce the regulatory watch on the prolonged infancy of the biotechnology industry. Noting "an uncertain regulatory environment in some areas," the Council urges consistency among the major agencies in bio-tech regulation: the Environmental Protection Agency, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Department of Agriculture. The major change called for is government-wide regulatory principles that would "focus on the characteristics and risks of the biotechnology product—not the process by which it was created." However, the unsettled state of political sentiments on this issue is reflected in the Council's suggestion that the White House sidestep Congress and achieve its regulatory goals by administrative decree.

Order from: Executive Office of the President, Publications Services, Room 2200, 725 17th St. NW, Washington, DC 20503; tel. 202/395-7332.

**Technology Against Terrorism: The Federal Effort** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01226-3; 10 pp., \$1), unclassified summary of a study delivered to Congress last fall by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), lifting the curtain a bit on efforts to develop and apply high-tech counters to terrorism. What's revealed, though skimpily, is a bureaucratic quagmire involving 20 federal agencies with budgets totaling \$70 million, and a House-Senate split on funding. OTA reports that a Technical Support Working Group, responsible for providing "seed money" for promising ventures outside of the agencies' normal interests, has declined in budget from \$7 million in 1988 to \$2 million in 1990, with harmful effects on the research effort. The Technical Group, OTA says, is the "only government body

with both the mandate and the practical ability to coordinate R&D efforts over the entire spectrum of counterterrorist technologies." A more extensive unclassified summary of the anti-terrorism report "will follow in several weeks, having been delayed by the security-review process." A second phase of the anti-terrorism study is continuing at OTA, with a report due for delivery to Congress next fall.

Also from OTA:

**Adjusting to a New Security Environment: The Defense Technology and Industrial Base Challenge** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01225-1; 16 pp., \$1.50), foreshadowing a major OTA report scheduled for spring 1992, this "background paper" skims over the issues of the scale and scope of defense industries in the post-Cold War period. About all it says is, yeah, we've got a problem here and addressing it will require decisions about the size and nature of the base, timing of transitions, and organization and planning, etc.

**Changing by Degrees: Steps to Reduce Greenhouse Gases** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01223-5; 370 pp., \$16; also in 42-page summary, GPO Stock No. 052-003-01224-3, \$2.75), in response to assessment requests from six Congressional committees, OTA says that without relying on technological breakthroughs, the US can reduce carbon-dioxide emissions by as much as 35 percent over the next 25 years. That's the "tough" scenario, relying heavily on strict conservation, energy-supply and forest-management measures. Lesser efforts would be helpful, too, OTA says, but would yield smaller results. OTA stresses that "a strong R&D effort" is essential to reduce hazardous emissions, and that many of the steps proposed are desirable for concerns other than climate effects.

**Finding the Rx for Managing Medical Wastes** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01204-9; 76 pp., \$4.75), says that two years after the summer of syringes and old bandages on holiday beaches, "much of the confusion and inconsistency associated with medical-waste policy still persist." OTA notes that available methods for reducing waste are far from fully employed and that more waste-management training for health workers would also help.

Still available is OTA's 1988 background paper **Issues in Medical Waste Management** (GPO Stock No. 052-003-01138-7; \$2.25).

Order OTA publications from: USGPO, Superintendent of Documents, Washington, DC 20402-9325; tel. 202/783-3238.

**US Food Exports: Five Countries' Standards and Procedures for Testing Residues:** (GAO/NSIAD-91-90; 26 pp., no charge), by the General Accounting Office, findings of a survey undertaken at Congressional request after reports of Alar residues on US-produced grapefruits reduced Asian sales of the product in 1989, though Alar is not used on grapefruits, GAO states. The food-standards issue is of increasing political sensitivity because of US export aspira-

(Continued on Page 7)



